Violence Prevention Focused on Children and Youth: Therapeutic Foster Care

Summary Evidence Table

Author & year Design suitability: design Quality of execution	Location Study period Population	Duration Training Support Intervention Components Control Group	Sample selection Assignment to treatment conditions Sample size (at assessment)	Effect measure Effect reported in the study	Relative pct change (significance level)
Chamberlain 1990 ¹ Highest: prospective with comparison Fair	Oregon Period not given Adolescents with multiple risk factors and histories of delinquency; 12–18 years old at first referral; Mean age 14.6; 10 boys, 6 girls per intervention and comparison group	~5 months Foster families received 8 hours of training conducted by project case managers and experienced TFC parent; Focused on using behavior management methods to provide structured living environment Weekly foster parent group meetings conducted by case manager, program director, therapists, and clinical consultant; Individual therapy for juveniles; Family therapy sessions for biological families; Daily (weekday) calls to foster parents; Home visits if returning home after placement; Case managers on call at all times Structured learning of prosocial behaviors; Monitoring of school, work, and leisure activities; Separation from delinquent peers Controls (matched on age, sex, and date of commitment to treatment) Treated in various settings: 8 in group homes, 4 in secure residential treatment center, 2 in parents' homes, 2 in programs similar to intervention TFC program	Juveniles committed to state training school, then diverted to community treatment. Selection not described. Controls matched on age, sex and date of commitment to treatment I: n = 16 C: n = 16	Proportion incarcerated in state training schools Baseline: 75% each group; 1st year after exit: Intervention: 37.5% Control: 87.5% 2nd year period following exit: Intervention: 50.0% Control: 93.8%	1 yr: -57.1% (p <0.01) 2 yrs: -46.7% (p = 0.018)

Author & year Design suitability: design Quality of execution	Location Study period Population	Duration Training Support Intervention Components Control Group	Sample selection Assignment to treatment conditions Sample size (at assessment)	Effect measure Effect reported in the study	Relative pct change (significance level)
Chamberlain 1994 ² Lowest: before-and-after; no comparison Good	Oregon Period not given Adolescents with multiple risk factors and histories of delinquency; 12–18 years old at first referral; Mean age 14.5 for boys, 14.8 for girls; 51 boys, 37 girls; ~52% from families with income <\$10,000/year	~6 months Foster families received 8 hours of training conducted by project case managers and experienced TFC parents; Focused on using behavior management methods to provide structured living environment Weekly foster parent group meetings conducted by case manager, program director, therapists, and clinical consultant; Individual therapy for juveniles; Family therapy sessions for biological families; Daily calls (on weekdays) to foster parents; Home visits if returning home after placement; Case managers on call 24/7; Structured learning of prosocial behaviors; Separation from delinquent peers; Monitoring of school, work, and leisure activities Control: effect in boys compared with effect in girls, before and after the intervention	Consecutive referrals, presumably all eligible No control population, boys compared to girls, before and after intervention I: n = 88	Number of arrests for violent crimes 1 yr pretreatment: Boys: 0.52 Girls: 0.45 1 yr after exit: Boys: 0.13 Girls: 0.18	Boys: -75% Girls: -60% (p <0.001)

Author & year Design suitability: design Quality of execution	Location Study period Population	Duration Training Support Intervention Components Control Group	Sample selection Assignment to treatment conditions Sample size (at assessment)	Effect measure Effect reported in the study	Relative pct change (significance level)
Chamberlain 1998 ³ Highest: prospective with comparison Good	Oregon Period not given Boys with multiple risk factors and histories of delinquency; 12–17 years old at first referral; Mean age 14.9; 85% White, 6% Latino, 6% Black, 3% Native American	~7 months Foster families received 20 hours of training conducted by project case managers and experienced MTFC parents; Focused on using behavior management methods to provide structured living environment Weekly foster parent group meetings conducted by case manager, program director, therapists, and clinical consultant; Individual therapy for juveniles; Family therapy sessions for biological families; Daily calls (on weekdays) to foster parents; Home visits if returning home after placement; Case managers on call at all times	Consecutive referrals, presumably all eligible	Felony assault scale of Elliott Behavior Checklist Intervention: 1.2 Control: 2.7	-55.6% (p = 0.05)
			I: n = 37 C: n = 42	Regression: Felony assault as dependent variable, controlled for age at first criminal referral, age at baseline, prereferral rate of felony assault	$\beta = -0.265$ (p = 0.023)
		Structured learning of prosocial behaviors; Separation from delinquent peers; Monitoring of school, work, and leisure activities Controls enrolled in group care (GC) programs			
		with 6–15 boys per residence; more emphasis placed on peer influence, less on adult influence; 83% of participants attended inhouse schools, 77% participated in group therapy, 67% participated in individual therapy			

Author & year Design suitability: design Quality of execution	Location Study period Population	Duration Training Support Intervention Components Control Group	Sample selection Assignment to treatment conditions Sample size (at assessment)	Effect measure Effect reported in the study	Relative pct change (significance level)
Evans 1998 ⁴ Lowest: before-and-after; no comparison (Study designed as prospective with comparison. Review preferred before-and-after comparison as control) Good	New York Recruitment completed July 1995 Seriously emotionally disturbed children 5–13 years old at first referral; Mean age 9; 90% male; 83% White, 5% Native American, 5% Black; 56% living in poverty; 34% of parents chronically unemployed	~17 months Foster families received 18 hours of training conducted by family specialist (mental health professional) Focused on prosocial skills and ABC model of behavior analysis and planning (Antecedents to problem behaviors, Behaviors, and Reinforcing/Consequences) Foster families organized into support groups of 5 families each, plus one respite family and family specialist, met weekly to monthly; Informal family contacts among parents and children within support groups; Family specialist (mental health professional) provides needs evaluation, coordination, and on-going treatment support Structured learning of prosocial behaviors; Reinforcement of positive behaviors and skills Control: compared participants before and after intervention	All eligible Random I: n = 12 C: n = 16	Externalizing scale of Child Behavior Checklist Pre-treatment Intervention: 67.00 Control: 76.46 Post-treatment Intervention: 68.67 Control: 73.19	2.5% (Statistical significance not reported)

Author & year Design suitability: design Quality of execution	Location Study period Population	Duration Training Support Intervention Components Control Group	Sample selection Assignment to treatment conditions Sample size (at assessment)	Effect measure Effect reported in the study	Relative pct change (significance level)
Rubinstein 1978 ⁵ Highest: prospective with comparison Fair	Ontario, Canada Recruitment from 1972–1975 Emotionally disturbed children 6–12 years old at referral; Mean age 9 years, 4 months; 19 boys, 8 girls in Intervention group; 37 boys, 8 girls in Control group	~18.7 months Foster families received 8 training sessions (length and contact not described) Foster families organized into support groups of 5 families each that meet weekly to monthly, led by staff member (social worker, psychometrist, or child care worker); Informal family contacts among parents and children within support groups; Home visits if planning to return home after placement; Contacts with biological families Clear definitions of treatment goals and specific strategies to achieve them Controls placed in residential treatment centers	All eligible in residential assessment cottage Not random Int. n = 27 Control n = 45	Conduct disorder scale of Quay-Peterson Behavior Problem Checklist Girls, Pre-treatment Intervention: 11.6 Control: 13.1 Girls, Post-treatment Intervention: 9.3 Control: 8.0 Boys, Pre-treatment Intervention: 18.2 Control: 19.1 Boys, Post-treatment Intervention: 9.7 Control: 10.2	Girls: 31.3% Boys: -0.2% (Not statistically significant)

B (regression coefficient in Chamberlain '98 study); C comparison group; I intervention group; TFC therapeutic foster care; yr year

References

- 1. Chamberlain P. Comparative evaluation of specialized foster care for seriously delinquent youth. Community Alternatives: International Journal of Family Care 1990;2(2):21–36.
- 2. Chamberlain P. Outcome evaluation of treatment foster care program participants. In: Chamberlain P, ed. Family connections: a treatment foster care model for adolescents with delinquency. Eugene, OR: Castalia Publishing Co., 1994:85–95.
- 3. Chamberlain P, Reid JB. Comparison of two community alternatives to incarceration for chronic juvenile offenders. J Consult Clin Psychol 1998;66(4):624–33.
- 4. Evans ME, Armstrong MI, Kuppinger AD, Huz S, McNulty TL. Preliminary outcomes of an experimental study comparing treatment foster care and family-centered intensive case management. In: Epstein MH, Kutash K, Duchnowski A, eds. Outcomes for children and youth with emotional and behavioral disorders and their families: programs and evaluation best practices. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed, 1998:543–80.
- 5. Rubinstein JS, Armentrout JA, Levin S, Herald D. The parent-therapist program: alternate care for emotionally disturbed children. Amer J Orthopsychiat 1978;48(4):654–62.